

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

THE NASHVILLE CONVENTION.—ITS ORIGIN AND ITS OBJECTS.

We have barely time, before hearing any thing of the actual event of "the Southern Convention," now in session at Nashville, to pay due attention to certain developments which have lately been made in the State of Mississippi touching its origin, and to a Letter of Chief Justice SHARKEY, addressed to the Editor of "the Southern," animadverting upon our late reply to his letter to the Editors of the National Intelligencer, and vindicating the objects of the Nashville Convention, as understood by himself and some other Whig gentlemen in the South.

With regard to the origin and principal features of this scheme of a Southern Convention we shall add nothing of our own to the statements which we are about to introduce to our readers, except that the rumor substantiated by the following evidence reached this city about the time of the death of Mr. CALHOUN, and the recovery of that lamented event has induced us hitherto to pass it by without comment. By publications in the Mississippi newspapers, however, it has now become matter of history, which we have no right to withhold from the knowledge of our readers.

We copy, then, from "the Southern," published at Jackson, the seat of government of the State of Mississippi, the following Letter from Mr. CALHOUN, the production of which was elicited by a direct appeal made by the Editor of the Southern, stating the rumor of the existence of such a Letter, and of its contents, and urging irresistible arguments why the Letter should be produced by the gentleman who had it in possession, to enable the Public to judge for itself of its contents:

A LETTER FROM MR. CALHOUN TO COL. C. S. TARPLEY, OF MISSISSIPPI.

PORT HILL, July 9, 1849.

DEAR SIR: I am greatly obliged to you for a copy of the proceedings of your [Mississippi] meeting. I have read it with a great deal of pleasure.

You ask me for my opinion as to the course which should be adopted by the [Mississippi] State Convention, in October next. I have delayed answering your letter until this time, that I might more fully notice the developments at the North before I gave it. They are more and more adverse to us every day. There has not been a single occurrence, since the rising of Congress, which does not indicate on the part of the North a fixed determination to push the abolition question to the last extreme.

In my opinion there is but one thing that holds out the promise of saving both ourselves and the Union; and that is a Southern Convention, and that, if much longer delayed, cannot. It ought to have been held this fall, and ought not to be delayed beyond another year. All our movements ought to look to that result. For that purpose, every Southern State ought to be organized, with a central committee, and one in each county. Our's is already. It is indispensable to produce concert and prompt action. In the mean time, firm and resolute resolutions ought to be adopted by you and such meetings as may take place before the assembling of the Legislatures in the fall. They, when they meet, ought to take up the subject in the most solemn and impressive manner.

The great object of a Southern Convention should be, to put forth in a solemn manner the causes of our grievances in an address to the other States, and to admonish them, in a solemn manner, as to the consequences which must follow, if they should not be redressed, and to take measures preparatory to it, in case they should not be. The call should be addressed to all those who are desirous to save the Union and our institutions, and who, in the alternative, should be forced on us, of submission or dissolving the partnership, would prefer the latter.

No State could better take the lead in this great conservative movement than yours. It is destined to be the greatest of sufferers if the abolitionists should succeed; and I am not certain but by the time your Convention meets, or at farthest, your Legislature, that the time will have come to make the call.

With great respect, I am, &c.

J. C. CALHOUN.

Upon this Letter the Editor of "the Southern" makes the following pithy comment:

Now let us see if the action in Mississippi did not accord with the recommendations contained in this letter.

We had a Convention in October. Mississippi took the lead. A central committee was organized. They attempted to appoint committees in the counties. "Firm and resolute resolutions" were adopted by the October Convention. "The Legislature took up the subject in the most solemn and impressive manner." It reserved in the treasury the small sum of two hundred and twenty thousand dollars, to enable the "Nashville Convention to take the preparatory steps" spoken of by Mr. Calhoun. This is as far as things have yet gone; for the sequel we must abide the action of the Nashville Convention.

To show how far the recommendations of the committee correspond with those of Mr. Calhoun, we give an extract from their address:

"Beside and beyond a popular Convention of the Southern States, with the view and the hope of arresting the cause of aggression, and if not practicable, then to concentrate the South in will, understanding, and action, the Convention of Mississippi suggested, as the possible ultimate resort, the call by the Legislatures of the assailed States, of still more solemn conventions, such as should be regularly elected by the people of those States to deliberate, speak, and act with all the sovereign power of the people. Should, in the result, such conventions be called and met, they may lead to a like regularly constituted convention of all the assailed States, to provide in the last resort for their separate welfare, by the formation of a compact and a Union that will afford protection to their liberties and their rights."

The consummation of the project here set forth would be just about as likely to preserve the Union as Mr. Calhoun's. Each would take steps preparatory to dissolve, in order to preserve it.

[No reader who has paid attention to the history of this Convention can fail to observe the like conformity of the acts and resolutions of the Legislatures of Georgia and Virginia, as in those of the Legislature of Mississippi, to the programme included in the Letter of Mr. CALHOUN.]

"If we analyze Mr. Calhoun's letter, and compare with its recommendations the suggestions of the address of the committee of the October Convention," continues the Editor of the Southern, "we shall find not only that the statements going the rounds of the newspaper press are true, but that the action in reference to the October Convention has thus far corresponded precisely with the recommendations of Mr. Calhoun's letter."

"For, although the letter does not contain the word 'secession,' yet it contains what is worse, the idea that our Union is but a mere partnership, and that the same shall be destroyed at all hazards, if a portion of the people who are parties to a common compact cannot have things just as they may desire."

"That the action of the October Convention corresponded strictly with the recommendations of Mr. Calhoun is denied, we believe, by but few; nor indeed can it be, by any fair-minded man who will compare the letter with the action of that body."

"But it has been said, and will no doubt be insisted on, that the measures proposed in the letter are very harmless; and if they were not, that they had no influence upon the action of the Convention. The idea of dissolving this governmental partnership of ours, in order to save and preserve the Union, may be a very harmless idea with some people, especially with those who would, hesitate at nothing calculated to advance their own corrupt party aims; but the great mass of the people view it in a different light."

"These recommendations of Mr. CALHOUN had been asked for; they were given with great deliberation; he had

delayed giving them until he had surveyed the Northern horizon, and scanned the developments in that quarter. He advises the organization of committees in every Southern State, and in all the counties, 'to produce concert and prompt action.' He advises an address to the free States setting forth the cause of grievance, and admonishing them, in the most solemn manner, of the consequences (dissolution) if they should not be redressed. That measures should be taken preparatory to a refusal on the part of the North to accede to our demands. Preparatory to what? To a dissolution of the Union, of course, if our demands were not complied with. This is one way to save the Union. This preparatory call should be addressed to those who are willing to save the Union; yet they must, nevertheless, be such as would be willing to dissolve this partnership, if they could not have things their own way. This preparatory call is not to be addressed to those who, although desirous of saving the Union, were not willing to dissolve this partnership. They were not to be consulted, however numerous, in the setting up of this new, this 'Southern Confederacy.' No; this was to be brought about by those who favored a dissolution of the Confederacy, without ascertaining, by any just test, whether a majority of the people of the Southern States prefer to remain in the Union, or to go out of it."

"Hence sprung the measure in our Legislature last winter, to place at the disposal of our Governor the enormous sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of the people's money. Hence the tenacity with which the disunion members of that body insisted on this appropriation. When this large sum was struck out of the Senate bill, in the House, the Senate refused to concur in the amendment, and the House, at length, so modified the clause as to reserve the sum of two hundred thousand dollars for the use of the Legislature—not the Governor—and it went to the Senate, and was thus adopted. This large sum was reserved with a view, no doubt, to Mr. Calhoun's preparatory measure for the dissolution of the Union, in the event that he and his friends could not get the North to agree to his absurd project of an amendment of the Federal Constitution, so as to give the South the same power in Congress that the North has; no matter how great the disparity in the amount of their respective populations."

"Let any man of candor examine this letter and compare the measures there recommended, with those suggested in the committee's address put forth to the people of Mississippi, and say if the former is not the prototype of the latter."

With regard to the Letter of Judge SHARKEY to the Editor of "the Southern," we do not find ourselves required to add any thing to what we have heretofore had occasion to say in direct reply to his letter to us, except upon two points.

First. The Judge says that we give him "more credit than I am entitled to, in ascribing to me the authorship of the Address. That honor is due to another—to a gentleman long known in this State, and justly distinguished for the purity of his character, his talents, and his learning, and who, in point of accuracy of political information, would contrast very advantageously even with the Editors of the 'Intelligencer.'"

Upon the point of fact, whilst we cheerfully relieve the Judge from the imputed authorship of the Address, we presume to say that nearly every one—every one out of the State of Mississippi, at least—was as much misled on that subject as we were. The zeal of his defence of that address, and the temper which characterized his letter, certainly would have removed from our mind any doubt, had we entertained any, of his being the author. We stand corrected, however; whilst, in regard to the comparison instituted by the honorable Judge between the accuracy of political information, &c. of the real author of that address (our adversary unknown), and the award of superiority in that respect to those of the Editors of the National Intelligencer, we bow with unfeigned submission to his judgment in the premises.

Secondly. The Judge says: "What is also strange, the Convention is condemned when it will have no power. It is to be a mere advisory body, called for the purpose of recommending to the people some plan by which our grievances can be removed, harmony restored, and the Union preserved. It will have no power to dissolve the Union, if it would. It will have no power to inflict an injury on the country. It is powerless for evil," &c. And again: "It is said the Nashville Convention is a scheme devised for the dissolution of the Union. Those who so assert have greatly mistaken its object. The reverse is true; it originated in a desire to preserve the Union, by preventing a blow which might prove fatal to its existence. All will admit that there were just grounds for these apprehensions."

We have never doubted, as our readers will bear us witness, that many who have been earnest advocates of the Convention project, are also sincere friends to the Union, intending no disparagement to it, but suffering themselves to be hoodwinked as to the actual purposes of persons whose plans were too deeply laid to be visible upon the surface. But, lest the Judge and other Whigs of the South should not yet be undeceived as to the concuring sentiments of intelligent men in different parts of the South on this subject, we append to this hasty notice one of the evidences to this effect, of recent date, from a source of the highest respectability. It is a letter from the Hon. JAMES A. MERIWETHER, well known as a Whig of high standing, formerly a Representative in Congress from the State of Georgia, in which he gives his reasons for declining to act as a Delegate to the Nashville Convention, when, without his agency, elected for that purpose. To this Letter, from a source so entitled to confidence, we ask the whole attention of our readers:

To the Voters of the 7th Congressional District: The Legislature at its last session recommended to the consideration of the people the propriety of sending Delegates to a Convention to be held at Nashville next month. The occasion for the approval of such recommendation was the first Tuesday in April next, when those delegates should be elected by popular vote.

My name was presented as one of the candidates for delegate from this district, to be voted for in the event the people should approve the recommendation.

The election has transpired, and I have been declared legally elected.

Ought I, under all the circumstances, to consider myself as rightfully entitled to represent and speak for the people of this district? Have they by their acts approved the propriety of sending delegates to that Convention? I think not, and will state to you my reasons for so thinking.

From the important and extraordinary character of the proposed Convention, no attempt should be made to find any portion of the people by its acts, except those who have unequivocally consented to be bound. This district is composed of nine counties, containing in all a voting population of eight thousand persons. Of this number of counties only two responded to the recommendation of the Legislature by opening their polls at all; the other seven refused any consideration whatever of the proposition! The two counties which did open the polls voted only one hundred and thirty-nine votes, out of a voting population of seventeen hundred voters. One of these counties opened the polls only at a remote precinct, and voted only twenty-seven votes out of one thousand voters!

With these facts before me, I cannot presume to think myself a representative, rightfully so, of the people of this district. But, furthermore, the facts seem to justify the belief that the people have had no hand in this movement in any way. The propriety of calling this Convention was never agitated before them. During the last political canvass not a public meeting in a single county in this district has been held ad-

vising it. Not a meeting has been held in a single county approving the call after it was made, except a small meeting in this county numbering some two dozen persons.

The people have taken no part in suggesting candidates, and have honored those presented to them with neither their votes nor their countenance.

Several who did vote have assured me they were opposed to the Convention, and voted alone from personal considerations.

My intercourse with the people has satisfied me that they condemn and distrust the Convention throughout, and that this feeling belongs to no class or party, but is the feeling of the people en masse.

As such, I can neither do myself nor the people the injustice to assert and exercise the right of representing and binding them by my acts. I will never consent, under such circumstances, to thrust myself into the position of a representative, when the constituency have declared so unequivocally that they do not desire the relation to exist under any terms. And if the Executive can find any man in this district who can consent to represent the people by his appointment, when they have refused to be represented by their own acts, he is at liberty to confer such position upon him.

Under ordinary circumstances, the refusal of the people to attend the polls would no discredit as to the person elected; for with an agreement that elections should be thus held under the Government, this refusal is a concession by the majority that the minority may rule under the forms of law.

The present is a very different case. Here the people are asked to assent to a particular act; therefore their assent must be shown, not presumed. They never contracted with their representatives in the Legislature for the exercise of the right of calling Conventions, in view, possibly, and ultimately, of an overthrow of the Government. This is an attribute of sovereignty reserved to themselves, and was usurped when exercised by the Legislature. There must, therefore, have been some positive act on the part of the people assenting to this recommendation before any act of a few of them can bind the whole; and in my judgment the mere omission to attend the polls, and a positive refusal to open the polls, were not such acts as would justify the inference that they approved the Convention, and desired to be represented in it. These facts seem to me to prove the very reverse.

It is perhaps unnecessary to enter into a detailed exposition of the causes which have prejudiced the public mind against the proposed Convention.

As an independent measure, with no other purposes than those strictly advisory, such a convention might, in my opinion, have been rendered exceedingly valuable in checking encroachments upon our rights, as well as in restoring the brotherly feeling which should animate all parts of the Union. But its capacity to do good has been destroyed, and now it can only do mischief to a good cause. It had better be abandoned at once, than persisted in only to accomplish injury and prejudice.

At an early day the public mind was astounded at what it believed were the purposes of those who advocated the call of the Nashville Convention. The overthrow of the Government, and the formation of a Southern Confederacy, were apprehensions which seized upon the popular feeling; and while our representatives at Milledgeville were working each other up into a perfect frenzy, the people at home were quietly condemning all their acts, if not wrong in motive, at least mischievous in effect.

The Mississippi Convention, which first recommended that at Nashville, in their address held the following very significant language:

"Besides and beyond a popular Convention of the Southern States, with the view and hope of arresting the course of aggression, and if not practicable then to concentrate the South in will, understanding, and action, the Convention of Mississippi suggested, as the possible ultimate resort, the call by the Legislatures of the assailed States, of still more solemn conventions, such as should be regularly elected by the people of those States, to deliberate, speak, and act with all the sovereign power of the people. Should, in the result, such conventions be called and met, they may lead to a like regularly constituted Convention of all the assailed States, to provide in the last resort for their separate welfare, by the formation of a compact and a union that will afford protection to their liberties and their rights."

The sense of this language, somewhat obscured by the arts of the rhetorician, but the plain English is, that the Nashville Convention was to arrest the course of aggression, and if not, then to concentrate the action and the feelings of the South. The State Legislatures were to call State Conventions, and each State, through its Convention, to withdraw from the Union, and this was to lead to a general Convention to form a Southern Confederacy!

Our Legislature seemed determined to act up to the very letter of the Mississippi address. They did all in their power to perfect the plan of disunion shadowed forth in the scheme of that irresponsible cabal.

They recommended the sending of delegates to the Nashville Convention, and seeming to fear lest the action of that body might "assist the course of aggression," they would not wait that action, but manifesting an overweening anxiety to break up the Government, they invited the people to meet in a State Convention, to "take into consideration the mode and measure of redress," and made one of the pretenses for this act of revolution the admission by Congress of the people of California to the right of self-government under the Constitution.

And to evince more fully the inconsistency and want of loyalty in the last Legislature, they made the prohibition of slavery heretofore by Congress, in any of the Territories of the United States, another ground for dissolving the Union, and appropriated thirty thousand dollars for the pay of a State Convention to withdraw Georgia from the Union! At the same time Congress had passed a law prohibiting slavery in Oregon, which had received the sanction of President Polk, and yet not one word of censure even was cast upon this act by the last Legislature. If true unconstitutional to prohibit slavery in California or New Mexico, and was such an act as to deserve to break up this Government, what is the reason the same act was constitutional as to Oregon, and deserved to be acquiesced in? Every man knows there is no difference between the two cases; they are identically the same—the inconsistency of the two acts points to the motive which has prompted the course pursued.

The first act in this drama has been submitted to the people and condemned almost unanimously—the next, the assembling of the disunion Convention at Milledgeville, through whose action Georgia is to withdraw from the Union, will find itself without friends or apologists.

With these facts before them, it is no wonder that the people should condemn the Nashville Convention. It had a common parentage with the disunion State Convention, and was believed to be designed to prepare their minds for this other final fatal step.

The question is often asked, if the Legislature designed this body merely as an advisory one, why pass the last alternative upon the people, before its councils could be examined, possibly before they could be had? Why seek to thrust the people into resistance to the laws of their Government by dissolving the Union, if the people of California should be admitted to the right of self-government, if the preservation of the Union was really designed?

The unwarrantable extremes resorted to by the last Legislature have satisfied the public mind that loyalty was wanting on the part of those who concerted and supported this series of Conventions, and hence the uncompromising opposition of the people to the entire action of that body. It is for this reason they are unwilling to be represented in the Nashville Convention, intending to be bound by no act which these Conventions may do.

It cannot be disguised that the people are opposed to a dissolution of the Union. They regard that as no remedy for their wrongs. It will not place slavery in Oregon, California, or New Mexico, while it will only serve to disturb the right to property, destroy the protection of the law to rights of person and property now enjoyed, and will hazard, at least, the happiest and freest Government on earth, and risk the acquisition of a despotism in its place.

Concurring in these views and feelings, had I taken a seat in the Nashville Convention, I should have opposed the first efforts to bring about disunion, now or in the future. And I shall resist to the utmost of my feeble abilities any attempt by a State Convention (to be called when California is admitted into the Union, which will shortly occur) to withdraw Georgia from the Union.

Your obedient servant,

JAMES A. MERIWETHER. EATON, MAY 15, 1850.

In consideration of the ascertained meeting of a number of Delegates at Nashville from Southern States, for the purpose of holding a Convention, we relinquish the intention of publishing the further evidences in our possession of the unconstitutional objects of some of the favorers of that Convention, with the exception of one of them, which is in its nature too formal and authentic not to be entitled to particular notice. We find it in the South Carolina "Telegraph" of Wednesday last, in the form of a speech delivered by Col. S. W. TROTTER, of Barnwell, in South Carolina, at the meeting held at Waterborough, for the purpose of electing Delegates to the Nashville Convention. For the information of our readers as to the purposes for which these and other Delegates from that neighborhood have been sent to the Nashville Convention, we make such extracts from the speech in question as are calculated to shed light upon that subject, viz:

EXTRACTS FROM COL. TROTTER'S SPEECH.

"In the great revolution which achieved our own independence, ten years of discussion had brought no redress, and nothing was done until the tea was thrown overboard in Boston harbor. And I have thought, in the great struggle in which the South has been so long engaged, and in which it required no discussion to convince us that we were contending for rights as clear 'as though they had been written by the hand of God upon a sunbeam in the heavens,' that some one Southern State should make the issue, and that the others, having a common interest, would be compelled to stand by her. Men may differ on immaterial points, and dispute may widen the gap of their differences. But when 'the ship is in the midst of the sea, tossed by the waves'—when the tempest is breaking wildly over her—

"When the strained mast quivers like a reed—

"And rent canvass flutters the gale"—it is then that each man will fly to the post of danger—all will contend for the common safety, and he who at such a moment would falter in his duty would be swayed from the yard arm. I have thought that, in a case of common interest and dangers, action would best promote concert, but it has been supposed by many that concert will best promote action, and that we should be united before we act. The gallant State of Mississippi, fresh from the field of Buena Vista, with the garlands of victory clustering on her brow, indignant at the wrongs heaped upon the South—indignant that she should not be allowed an equal interest in the territory for which she had poured out her Southern blood, has recommended to her Southern sister States to appoint delegates to meet in Convention at Nashville next month, to devise some plan of united Southern action against the efforts of the non-slaveholding States to deprive us of our rights. South Carolina, ever ready to act, and at the same time desirous to promote harmony and concert, has responded to the recommendations of her noble and valiant sister, and in obedience to her wishes we have been assembled here to-day, to appoint delegates to represent in the Nashville Convention the seventh Congressional district," &c.

"What that Convention will do is not for us to dictate. Our delegates should go untrammelled, and free to consult with the leading intellects that will be brought together from all parts of the South. But, as individuals, we may entertain and express an opinion as to what it should do. That Convention should say to the non-slaveholding States, the South will maintain her rights and 'equality' in the Union, or she will dissolve it."

"What else is left for us to do? Can we rely on the Constitution? Why, the constitution has long been utterly disregarded. You have over and over again seen it kicked out of both halls of Congress. The great and good men who achieved our independence have passed away, and the career crew that now swarm the halls of Congress have mesmerized the constitution, and made it speak in any language they wished. The constitution is rather an impediment than a protection to the South. The South regards the obligations it imposes, whilst the North treats them with utter contempt. But for the fact that we have been comforted with the belief that we lived under a constitution that protected our rights, it is not improbable that a Southern army would long ago have gone to Washington and dispersed Congress. Much as we boast of our freedom, I doubt if any legislative body, exercising the same unlimited powers as the Congress of the United States, would be tolerated in any part of Europe."

"God forbid that the people of the South should ever have a greater attachment for the Union than for their most sacred rights. If the Union cannot be re-constituted, then Congress is omnipotent, and our Government a despotism. The Union is King. When the emissaries of George the Third were endeavoring to crush the rebel spirit of the South, they made every swamp resound with the shouts of 'God save the King.' And so the Northern fanatics, whilst trampling on the constitution, and waging a war of extermination against the South, hope to check the proud spirit of resistance by making the wilkin ring with 'God save the Union.' But the South understands their miserable hypocrisy. We will not permit King Union to deprive us of rights which our ancestors would not have allowed King George to touch. We shall not be deterred from doing our duty by the cry of disunion, or, rebel, or traitor. The men who achieved our independence were disunionists. They had all been British subjects, and, rather than submit to what was wrong and unjust, declared their separation. Washington, the great father of his country, had borne a British commission, and had fought by the side of Braddock. We are just such disunionists as they were. Rather than submit to continued acts of injustice we prefer a separation. We have their bright example to cheer us."

"In what I have said I have had in contemplation the probability of the dissolution of the Union, and the foundation of a separate Southern Republic. I have not the slightest idea that the people of the non-slaveholding States will respect our rights, until they are made to feel our strength—our capacity for not only sustaining ourselves, but injuring them. And when they find themselves stripped of their commerce—their manufactures crippled, and their houses and lands sinking in value, then you may find greater efforts to put down abolition at the North than are now made to put down slavery at the South. If disunion comes, it would find the South better prepared to defend her institutions against the world, and, if she was still to continue in the Union, she would have acquired that power and influence which would cause her rights to be respected."

COMITY BETWEEN STATES. GOVERNOR CRITTENDEN, of Kentucky, is now on a visit to Governor WRIGHT, of Indiana. At Madison, Gov. Crittenden was met by a committee from the capital, and, after partaking of a complimentary dinner, proceeded to Indianapolis, where he was welcomed by the cordial greetings of a large concourse of people, who escorted him to the residence of Governor WRIGHT, where, during the afternoon, he was called upon by a large number of citizens and strangers. On the next day a procession was formed in front of the Washington Hall, and marched to the State House square, where Gov. Crittenden was introduced to the assembly by Gov. Wright. After which a meeting of the friends of the Union was held and addresses delivered. In the evening, Gov. Wright gave a public levee in honor of the distinguished guest. Citizens from all parts of the State attended, and every thing passed off in the best spirit.

LATE FROM CALIFORNIA. The steamer Alabama has arrived at New Orleans with San Francisco dates to May 1st. The report is that business at San Francisco was prosperous, with great activity, and prices advancing. The emigration to the mines was immense.

There is at this time but few Californians in St. Joseph, nearly all having left for the Plains. The number that have outfitted at this place amounts to nearly thirty thousand, and we hear of a few more small companies now on their way to St. Joseph, which will swell the number to at least thirty thousand.—St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette of May 17.

SLAVE SHOT.—By a law passed by the last Legislature of Massachusetts, any person who carries a slung shot is liable to a fine of fifty dollars; or imprisonment in the House of Correction for one year; and any person who manufactures such an article may be fined fifty dollars or imprisoned six months.

MUNICIPAL ELECTION.

The election for Mayor and members of the City Council took place in this city on Monday. The result is shown in the subjoined returns, by which it will be seen that WALTER LENOX, Esq., having received the highest number of votes given to any candidate for Mayor, has been elected to that office for the ensuing two years.

	First.	Second.	Third.	Fourth.	Fifth.	Sixth.	Seventh.	Total.
Walter Lenox.....	139	145	235	276	143	190	210	1336
R. C. Weightman.....	169	214	259	310	154	87	126	1999
George Waterston.....	3	0	0	0	23	0	0	26
William Gunton.....	3	1	7	3	0	1	0	13
Jesse E. Dow.....	25	97	27	23	48	119	46	379
Total vote.....								3053

MORE DECLINATIONS.

FROM THE SOUTHERN WHIG (ATLANTA, GEO.) OF MAY 30.

We have entertained apprehensions, since the election of Delegates in this State, that the apathy of the people, indicated on that occasion, would partially, if not entirely, deprive Georgia of a participation in the deliberations of the Southern council. These fears, so far as this district is concerned, have been fully realized. We publish below a letter from one of our delegates (Col. BILLUPS) setting forth his reasons for not accepting the trust, whilst we are informed the other, (Judge HILVER), probably for similar reasons, has also declined. This state of things is greatly to be deplored, and we say let the censures fall where it should justly attach. Certainly no blame can be imputed to these gentlemen for refusing to engage in a service from which (apparently at least) the impress of the popular sanction has been withheld:

ATLANTA, MAY 13, 1850.

Gov. TOWNS: Dear Sir: I have received from the executive department a communication covering a certificate of election as one of the delegates to the Nashville Convention from the sixth Congressional district. Whilst, sir, I may, with unaffected sincerity declare, that I am at all times ready and willing, at whatever hazard, to consecrate all my energies and capabilities to the vindication and maintenance of the constitutional rights and the honor of the South, yet I cannot consent to foist myself upon a reluctant or even an indifferent constituency. The unprecedented paucity of the vote, at the election of Delegates, does, in my judgment, amount to a condemnation (negative, it is true, but not the less emphatic) either of the proposed Convention or of the individuals presented for the suffrages of the electors. Viewing the subject in this aspect, I am constrained, by self-respect, as well as by what I conceive to be a proper regard for the popular will of the district, to decline the station to which you have proclaimed me elected.

With the highest consideration, sir, your obedient servant, JOHN BILLUPS.

THE WHEELING BRIDGE CASE.

Supreme Court of the United States, December Term, 1849.—The State of Pennsylvania, complainant, vs. The Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Company, William Ottersen, and George Croft, Bill in equity.

The Court having heard the counsel on the part of the complainant, and also on the part of the respondents, on the motion for an injunction in this cause to remove the obstruction of the navigation of the Ohio river, as charged in the original, amended, and supplemental bills of the complainant, by means of the erection of the suspension bridge in said bills mentioned, and which said obstruction is denied in the answers put in thereto by the respondents, and on due deliberation being had thereon, and upon the pleadings and proofs before us:

It is ordered that the cause be referred to the Hon. HENRY WALWORTH, late Chancellor of the State of New York, as a Commissioner of the Court, hereby appointed, to take such further proofs in the cause as the counsel for the respective parties may see fit to produce before him, at such time or times, and at such place or places, as he may appoint, on the application of the counsel of either party, due notice given of the time and place of the taking of said proofs—

1. Upon the question whether or not the bridge aforesaid, mentioned in the pleadings aforesaid, is or is not an obstruction of the free navigation of the said Ohio river, at the place where it is erected across the same, by vessels propelled by steam or sails, engaged, or which may be engaged, in the commerce or navigation of said river; and, if an obstruction as aforesaid shall be made to appear, what change or alteration in the construction and existing condition of the said bridge, if any, can be made, consistent with the continuance of the same across said river, that will remove the obstruction to the free navigation by the vessels aforesaid, engaged in the commerce and navigation of said river as aforesaid.

2. That the said Commissioner shall report to this Court by the first day of the next stated term thereof, upon the questions hereby referred to him, together with the proofs which shall have been produced before him by the respective parties; and that all other questions in the said cause shall be reserved until the coming in of the said report of the Commissioner, and the further hearing of counsel upon the matters therein.

3. That the said commissioner shall have the power, if deemed necessary by him, in the course of the hearing of the said cause, to appoint a competent engineer, whose duty it shall be to take the measurement of said bridge, its appendages and appurtenances, and localities in connection therewith, under the direction and instructions of said commissioner, and to make a report to him on the same; which report shall be annexed to the report of the commissioner to the court.

The said commissioner is hereby authorized to appoint a clerk to assist him in the execution of this commission. The compensation to be allowed to the said commissioner for his time and services, for his clerk and engineer that may be appointed, and all other necessary expenses by him incurred in said commission, upon the coming in of the report of the commissioner, will be ascertained and fixed, and awarded against the parties, as the court may deem right and proper, upon the principles of equity and justice.

And that the parties shall each advance to the said commissioner two hundred and fifty dollars each, before or at the time he enters upon the execution of this commission.

The clerk will send a certified copy of this order to the commissioner.

True copy—test: WM. THOS. CARROLL, C. S. C. U. S.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL MONUMENT OFFICE. Contributions received at this office from May 4th to June 1st, 1850, from the United States Navy, Banks, Masonic and Odd-Fellow Lodges, Institutions of Learning, &c.: Commander Geo. P. Uphur, United States Naval School, Annapolis, Md. \$192 00 Purser Thos. B. Nalle, for United States Pacific squadron..... 627 68 Capt. H. H. Cooke, United States ship St. Louis..... 444 00 Masonic Grand Lodge of Michigan..... 50 00 Grand Lodge I. O. O. F., Alabama..... 50 00 A Bank in Pennsylvania..... 50 00 Philadelphia Bank, Pennsylvania..... 100 00 Rising Sun Lodge No. 8 I. O. O. F., Pennsylvania..... 5 00 C. S. Rice, Oakwood Grammar School, Jefferson County, Mississippi..... 30 60 Faculty and Students of the University of Alabama..... 68 82 S. Kelly, 1st District School, Washington..... 1 10 T. Watkins, 2d do..... 1 13